REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-3 and 5 are canceled.

Claim 4 remains pending.

No new matter is believed to have been added.

Applicants respectfully submit Claim 4 is not anticipated by, or obvious in view of, <u>Drenski</u>, based on the following arguments:

In present Claim 4, the atomic ratio of molybdenum ranges from 0.1 to 15 when that of antimony is 10 (from formula (I) of Claim 4). Further, the atomic ratio of antimony ranges from 8 to 1200 when that of molybdenum is 12. Thus, in present Claim 4, Sb is an essential component and the atomic ratio of Sb to the atomic ratio of Mo is relatively high. The catalyst of present Claim 4 is therefore an "Sb catalyst."

In comparison, <u>Drenski</u> discloses an "Mo catalyst." In <u>Drenski</u>, Sb, while it can be present, is not an essential element. In the empirical formula of <u>Drenski's</u> catalyst, "B" of "B_b", can be one or more of Mg, Mn, Ni, Co, Ca, Fe, Ce, Sm, Cr, Sb and W; preferably, B is the combination of Fe and at least one element selected from the group consisting of Mg, Mn, Ca, Ce, Sn, Cr, Sb, and W, and "b" equals 5 to 12. Thus, in <u>Drenski</u>, Sb is not an essential component, because it's presence is optional. The non-essentiality of Sb is further underscored by the Examples of Drenski, none of which employ Sb.

Further, unlike the catalyst of present Claim 4, if Sb is present in <u>Drenski's</u> catalyst, the atomic ratio of Sb to the atomic ratio of Mo is relatively low.

Although the catalyst of present Claim 4 and the catalyst of <u>Drenski</u> can catalyze the same reaction, the compositions of the catalysts are different, especially, as previously described, in the ratio atomic ratio of Sb to the atomic ratio of Mo.

The catalyst of present Claim 4 has a further feature that the ratio of molybdenum and silicon (Mo/Si) in the catalyst surface and bulk has a specific relationship not found in the

Application No. 10/553,200

Reply to Office Action of May 3, 2007

catalyst of Drenski, because the catalyst of Drenski the catalyst may contain both

molybdenum and silicon because silica may be used as an inactive carrier.

In summary, Drenski does not describe or suggest the catalyst of present Claim 4

because, in the catalyst of present Claim 4, Sb is an essential component (Sb is an optional

component of <u>Drenski</u>) and because the atomic ratio of antimony to molybdenum is relatively

high in the catalyst of present Claim 4 when compared to the catalyst of Drenski. Further, as

a result of these differences, the catalyst of present Claim 4 obtains a high acrylonitrile

selectivity maintained for a long period of time.

Applicants submit the present application is now in condition for allowance. Early

notification to this effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,

MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Norman F. Oblon

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000 Fax: (703) 413 -2220 (OSMMN 06/04)

Charles J. Andres, Jr., Ph.D.

Attorney of Record

Registration No. 57,537